UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/506,189	02/17/2000	Simon Robert Smith	00138	7235

7590   02/22/2006

Mark G Kachigian
Head Johnson & Kachigian
228 West 17th Place
Tulsa, OK 74119

EXAMINER
WOOD, WILLIAM H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2193	

DATE MAILED: 02/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/506,189	SMITH ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William H. Wood	2193	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 November 2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5 and 8-10* is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5 and 8-10* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-3, 5 and 8-10 are pending and have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1-3, 5 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over **Boden** et al. (USPN 5,930,512) in view of **Entner** et al. (USPN

5,745,901).

Claim 1

Boden disclosed a method for creating and deploying a process-driven information

System *(column 2, lines 50-65)*, said method comprising the following steps:

- ◆ (a) creating a plurality of process models each including a plurality of

    elements in a process driven information system *(column 4, lines 55-64)*, said

    plurality of elements representing work carried out by personnel in an

    organization *(column 4, lines 55-64; column 8, lines 30-64)*, said plurality of

    process models forming a component of a hierarchical arrangement of cross

    referenced processes *(definition of workflow; i.e. the FlowMark product;*

    column 12, lines 26-27; further column 5, lines 38-49);

- ◆ (b) using <u>said plurality of process</u> models to identify requirements for software application and information support components for said processes *(column 4, lines 55-64; column 10, lines 28-29; and column 12, lines 45-49; FlowMark by IBM)*;

- ◆ (c) finding or creating one or more software application and information support components as support for said processes *(column 12, lines 45-49; FlowMark by IBM)*;

- ◆ (d) deploying the process-driven information system with said software application and information support components accessible from designated elements in said processes *(column 2, lines 50-65; column 13, lines 26-35; activities are elements)*, each element giving access to an application or information support component *(column 12, lines 23-28)*; and

- ◆ (e) selection by a user of <u>one of a plurality of</u> process models to display <u>said selected process model</u> on a screen to access <u>said software application and information support components</u> to direct the operation of said software application and information support components *(column 13, lines 26-35; Figures 11-20)*, and wherein said plurality of elements of said process model are provided in a tool which uniquely identifies each of said plurality of elements *(column 12, lines 19-34; FlowMark by IBM)* and which maps each of said plurality of elements to an application and information in the form of one or more software components *(column 12, lines 19-34; column 12, lines 45-49)* so as to allow user access from the process model displayed on the

screen to the one or more software components *(column 13, line 40 to*

column 14, line 7; column 13, lines 59-64; column 23, line 55 to column 24,

line 8).

- <u>said models accessed by a web browser and which links the model elements</u>

  <u>in the browser by uniquely identifying each element and corresponding web</u>

  <u>page and for each process model which is selected for display and interaction</u>

  <u>via the display screen a plurality of elements are displayed on the display</u>

  (column 13, line 40 to column 14, line 16)

Boden did not explicitly state ~~and wherein the user~~ *accessing a particular software and*

information support component ~~*is achieved*~~ *by the user interacting with the display*

screen to select, via a user selection tool, one of the plurality of model process elements

graphically displayed on the display screen, whereupon the software application and

information support component linked to the selected model process element is

generated on the display screen for use by the user. **Entner** demonstrated that it was

known at the time of invention to generate graphical elements by graphically selecting

them (column 5, lines 13-17, 31-33 and 35-40; figure 3). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the graphical work

flow system of **Boden** with graphical model interaction such that an element is

generated from the model as found in **Entner**'s teaching. This implementation would

have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to

increase the ease of use by a user (**Entner**: column 3, lines 4-9 and column 7, lines 52-

56).

Claim 2

Boden disclosed a method according to claim 1 wherein said process model is part of a

set of general purpose graphical business models *(column 8, lines 5-9)*.

Claim 3

Boden disclosed a method according to claim 2 wherein said process model is

accessible via a web browser *(column 2, lines 51-57)*.

Claim 5

Boden disclosed a method according to claim 1 wherein said one or more software

application and information support components are in the form of arbitrary alternative

web pages and web-based resources *(column 2, lines 58-65; column 24, line 60 to*

column 25, line 27; column 25, lines 44-54).

Claim 8

Boden did not explicitly state a method according to claim 1 wherein said process

model is used to educate users within an organization as to how the organization

processes functions. **Entner** demonstrated that it was known at the time of invention to

make use of workflow models for personnel training (column 3, lines 4-16). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement

the natural workflow graphics/models of **Boden** as educational tools as discussed by

Entner. This implementation would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in

the art would be motivated to provide easy to understand material (graphics) to users

and to make as much use of one tool as possible.

Claim 9

Boden disclosed a method according to claim 1 wherein said one or more software

application and information support components are in the form of arbitrary alternative

web pages or web-based resources *(column 2, lines 58-65; column 25, lines 44-54).*

Claim 10

The limitation of claim 10 are substantially the same as the limitation of claim 1 and as

such are rejected in the same manner. A periodic review and re-publish cycle is

disclosed by **Entner** column 5, lines 9-29 (the user interacts and changes the workflow

periodically).

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments filed 07 November 2005 have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive. Applicant argues: **Boden** does not disclose the plurality of

elements of a process model and **Entner** does not disclose selecting one of the plurality

of model process elements graphically displayed. These arguments are not found to be

persuasive. First, **Boden** clearly indicates a plurality of elements of a process model

(column 4, lines 55-63). **Boden** also discloses a plurality of process models (figure·4).

Entner states, "... the viewer tool which provides a way for users to view and take

actions on the object" (column 5, lines 13-17) and then later states, "User processing of

objects ..." (column 5, line 31). It is clear, from these statements at least, that **Entner** is

selecting and processing a variety of elements. Furthermore, the references are

combined in a properly motivated combination, which means the plurality of displayed

elements of **Boden** are processed via selection found in **Entner**. All of Applicant's

concerns having been addressed, the rejections are maintained as above indicated.

Conclusion

4.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Correspondence Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William H. Wood whose telephone number is (571)-272-3736. The examiner can normally be reached 9:00am - 5:30pm Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (571)-272-3719. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571)273-8300 for regular communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

William H. Wood
February 16, 2006

KAKALI CHAKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100